



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

attended by a squadron of horse, and in a chariot surrounded by men with battle-axes. Though the Irish Parliament copied that of England, it developed differences. Its House of Peers was insignificant. Long before any comforts appeared at Westminster, the Irish Parliament was a luxurious club, and most of the members of the Commons lived permanently in Dublin and were readily at the call of the government. In contrast with the rigorous exclusion practised in England, the public were allowed in crowds to attend the debates in the Irish Commons. Mr. Porritt does not find much in favor of "Grattan's Parliament"; indeed he departs a little from the reserve of the historian to say that Ireland has little cause to regret the loss of a Parliament so defectively constituted as hers was. It is the only child of the Mother of Parliaments that has ceased to exist.

So extensive a work is unlikely to be free from small defects. There is a good deal of repetition, and Mr. Porritt in his desire to illustrate the past by the present makes some assumptions hardly justified. It is doubtful, for instance, whether personal bribery has wholly disappeared from English elections (I. 164); if the gossip of the House of Commons is credible, elections are still won by buying votes, and there is a paradoxical conviction that the electors in the cathedral cities are the most corrupt. It is hard also to justify the assertion (I. 278) that in 1893 a majority was secured in the House of Commons for Mr. Gladstone's Home-Rule Bill, only because it was certain that the Lords would reject the measure. Mr. Porritt is too doctrinaire. Because of the obvious defects of the unreformed system he condemns it without reserve, and yet through it statesmen like Peel and Gladstone gained admission to public life. Westminster with its slum district is not entirely a city of "magnificent streets" (I. 567). Blount (I. 501) should be Blunt, and Roland (I. 290) was not the name of Rowland Hill. Scotsmen do not like in written discourse the term Scotch for Scottish; and country-house is better than "country homes" when buildings are indicated (I. 472). But these are trifles. Though the style is without distinction, it is clear. There are separate indexes for England, Scotland, and Ireland, and copious lists of authorities.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

Charles James Fox: a Political Study. By J. L. LE B. HAMMOND.
(London: Methuen and Company; New York: James Pott and Company. 1903. Pp. xi, 370.)

It would seem a brave man who in the face of Trevelyan's *Early History of Charles James Fox* and his *American Revolution* ventured to challenge comparison with those fascinating books by another volume on the same subject. Yet, aside from the fact that even such brilliant work as that of Trevelyan might, in our opinion, still leave a field for a more impartial biography of Fox, there is another reason for the appearance of Mr. Hammond's book. Save in very small measure, he deals only with that part of the life of Fox which Trevelyan's books have not yet

reached, and he would be the first, as he says in his preface, to deny that his book could in any way take the place of the work of him who has so largely inspired this present study. The present work, as he further declares, "is in no sense a biography". It is, as the chapter-scheme shows, rather a series of essays on the various phases of Fox's public career, grouped about those questions which seemed to dominate each phase or period. This plan gives to the book somewhat more of a logical than chronological continuity, but without wholly neglecting the latter, and it has the additional advantage of enabling the author to pursue his main purpose, a thoroughgoing defense of Fox, his public acts and policy, more coherently than could have been the case under almost any other arrangement. The first chapter, Preliminary, covers briefly that period elaborated in Trevelyan's *Early History*. The succeeding chapters take up in turn Fox and the king, Parliamentary reform, the Reign of Terror, Fox and Ireland, colonies and dependencies, in which is gathered his policy toward both America and India, Fox and the French Revolution, Fox's policy in 1792, Fox and nationalism, Fox and the French war, and religious toleration. The tone of the book shows unqualified admiration for its hero and breathes the spirit of militant liberalism. It is evident that, consciously or unconsciously, Mr. Hammond belongs to that group of literary Liberals who from Burke to Morley have voiced the doctrines of that political faith. But unlike the two on whom we have no doubt much relied in our estimate of this period, he sees no good in Pitt. Lord Macaulay and Lord Rosebery have given us estimates of that statesman which, differing as they do, seem none the less to draw together in the light of the present attack. In this respect Mr. Hammond's book at least gives us much to think about, and if we cannot always agree with his contentions, we are at least grateful for a new point of view and for arguments which, though old as the rivalry of the two great leaders, are here stated with freshness, clearness, and force. We are, indeed, grateful for more than this. The life of Fox has been singularly neglected, whether we consider his place in the politics of the time or in the general history of Liberalism. He was in a considerable part of his career the champion of lost causes, and of what seemed at times, in the clash of war, almost forgotten beliefs.

Though the times were against him and circumstances made, or seemed to make, many of his proposals impossible, the circumstances of his early life and his somewhat idealistic temperament, better fitted for intellectual conflict than for leadership, together with the antagonism of the king, and a certain general disbelief in his sincerity, seldom brought him into the conduct of affairs, or long maintained him there, he yet seems worthy of more attention than he has thus far received. To discuss in detail the work under consideration would be to rewrite the history of England for thirty years. But in general one may be permitted to say that, despite the author's vigor and conviction, it may perhaps be doubted whether, even if Fox were so uniformly right and Pitt well-nigh invariably wrong in the light of the long resolution of policies and events,

that is wholly the standard by which each should be judged, whether, in other words, the circumstances of the times and the responsibilities of office should not also be considered. Mr. Hammond does not merely adopt Macaulay's dictum that Pitt was feeble as a war minister, but he arraigns his good faith as a reformer as well, and his casual mention of Lord Rosebery may indicate at least one animus of the book. His views are indeed not all equally new nor all equally sound, but they are clearly presented and ably defended. His style has force and enthusiasm. Seeking to develop, from facts already largely known, theses not wholly new, he yet brings to the discussion an amount of information, argument, and illustration that makes the book a distinct contribution to the subject and to the period. This very force and enthusiasm do, indeed, lead at times to a certain floridity of phrase not wholly conducive to the exact apportionment of truth, nor, perhaps, adding much to the closeness of argument. It is picturesque to say of the colonists that they "lived in a moral atmosphere that was arctic to all the elegant fopperies of long-established social hierarchies, and their minds moved within the horizons of a sombre and morose religion", but one may be permitted to wonder how many would recognize this as a correct view of the complex human conditions of the American people before the Revolution. It may seem to some minds a fine phrase, as no doubt it is, to say that Fox "faced in the second great crisis of his life, bereft now of his stoutest comrades, the myriad phantoms of menace, and brooding hate, and unforgiving fury, in which the darkness of the hour avenges itself on those who dare to see beyond it". But it would seem that the greatness of the subject might well have sufficed without even a fine phrase. One lingers over the matter of style because it is so evident, and, despite these frequent passages of fine writing, a very great part of the undoubted charm of this work. It is an eminently readable narrative argument, not pretending to be the result of the laborious research of the scholar, or to contain masses of new material and impartial statements. Its bibliography smacks more of Campbell's *Lives of the Chancellors* and Lecky's works, of Morley and Rosebery, and such secondary authorities, than of manuscripts and archives and unpublished documents. Yet in the body of the book it has to do with such material and cannot be considered unscholarly. And it is, very decidedly, whether one agrees with it or not, a book to be read for the pleasure and information it gives, and in any estimate of the life or period it covers, a book to be reckoned with for the ability and force with which its theses are presented and defended.